

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's approval of the proposed drawing corrections to FIG. 6. A corrected drawing is submitted herewith.

Claim 1 stands objected to as being inconsistent with claim 2 (assumed to apply to claim 3). Applicants have cancelled claim 2 (and claim 3) having the term "input-output" and therefore request withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 1, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, and 10 to remove the language "as the control name of the output field or the input-output field, whichever is relevant". Applicants thus request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 3, 5, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 due to lack of antecedent basis regarding the term "control name". Applicants have amended these claims to clarify the referred-to control names in order to remove the antecedent basis problem, and request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being dependent on rejected claim 5. Claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 3 and 5 also stand rejected to as reciting the features of "a field character string", "an input-output field", and "an output field" in regard to the control name. The Examiner states that proper antecedence has not been given to each of these terms. Claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice. Claim 5 has been amended to more clearly define that the control name of the input-output field (the

input-output field to which the naming unit specifies a control name in claim 1) is based on the character string of the output field that is before this input-output field and exists closest to this input-output field. Applicants respectfully submit that the meaning of the control name as defined would be understood by one skilled in the art, and thus Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection. Claim 8 has been amended to remove the phrase “GUI screen”. Applicants thus request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected as being indefinite due to the stated use of alternative limitations. Claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice, and claim 6 has been amended to more clearly define that the naming unit adds a specific character string to one of the registered control name of the input-output field (defined in amended claim 1) and a registered control name of the output field. Applicants submit that the meaning of these features would be understood by one skilled in the art, and Applicants thus request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being of improper dependent form. Applicants have amended claim 6 and 8 to depend from amended claim 1, and requests that the rejection has been overcome.

Claims 1, 3, and 5-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshikawa. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the reason that Yoshikawa neither discloses nor suggests, among other features, a naming unit specifying a control name of an input-output field in a graphical user interface screen based on a character string of field information of an output field in a vicinity of the input-output

field, and registering the specified control name as the control name of the input-output field in a memory, as defined in independent claims 1, 9, and 10.

Yoshikawa is directed to converting a character based user interface (CUI) screen into a graphical user interface (GUI) screen. The invention defined in claims 1, 9, and 10 by contrast, is directed to determining a control name of an input-output field on a GUI screen based on a character string of an output field in its vicinity. While the Office Action cites a number of portions of Yoshikawa directed to formation of a GUI screen, none of the cited portions disclose or suggest at least the naming feature defined in claims 1, 9, and 10.

The Office Action cites the field name shown in Figure 7, and submits that Yoshikawa discloses not only the conversion of a screen from a CUI to a GUI, but also how to determine the control names of an input field and an input-output field. Applicants respectfully traverse this conclusion. Column 11, lines 29-40, cited in the Office Action, defines a rule system for producing a field name. Yoshikawa discloses:

In the example shown in Figure 7, a character string AB at the left ends of a screen name and a field name indicate an identification code, and the subsequent character P of each screen name indicates a screen name. The fourth character of each field name indicates the type of input-output. A character F indicates a fixed field, and a character O indicates an output field. Each of the other characters indicate a different name assigned to a different field.

Although the above description and the other descriptions of Yoshikawa cited in the Office Action disclose that rules are made in order to assign a different name to each of a fixed field, the input field, and an input-output field, Yoshikawa fails to disclose that the control name of an input-output field on a GUI-screen is determined based on the name of an

output field on a CUI screen. Instead, Yoshikawa merely discloses name assigning rules, according to which a different name is assigned to each field.

By use of the phrase "each of the other characters indicates a different name assigned to a different field", Applicants respectfully submit that Yoshikawa discloses the conventional system whereby, when a CUI screen is converted into a GUI screen, a programmer could assign an arbitrary name to each field. Even within this conventional system, certain rules could also be made in order to determine at least part of each field name, as illustrated by the letter codes described in Yoshikawa. However, this rule convention does not resolve the problem of how to determine the control name of each field on a GUI screen in such a way that persons other than a programmer can easily understand them.

The invention defined in claims 1, 9, and 10, by contrast, has addressed this problem by determining the control name of an input-output field on a GUI screen based on the character string of an output field in the vicinity of the input-output field on a CUI screen. Although Yoshikawa discloses name assigning rules, Yoshikawa fails to disclose any detail regarding solving the problem of arbitrary selection of field names under such rules. Yoshikawa fails to disclose that the control name of an input-output field is determined based on the character string of the field information of an output field in its vicinity. While Yoshikawa does disclose that the field names may include one or more codes, it also clearly discloses that, with the exception that remaining characters form an overall different name

for a different field, these additional, non-coded characters may be completely arbitrary. This is one of the problems the present invention is directed to addressing.

Furthermore, though Yoshikawa, as stated in the Office Action, discloses a display information setting generator, this setting generator is based upon previously existing screen definition information 6, as shown by example in Figure 7. In other words, the field names and other information shown in Figure 7 of Yoshikawa, as cited in the Office Action, are directed to screen definition information 6, which is not generated by the GUI screen generation program of Yoshikawa, but rather is previously defined information transmitted from a host computer 1 for use in processing. See, for example, column 5, line 57-column 6, line 14. In fact, Yoshikawa appears to be premised on the idea that previously defined document information may be used to produce GUI fields. For at least this additional reason, Yoshikawa does not appear to disclose or suggest a graphical user interface screen generating apparatus that includes a naming unit specifying a control name of the input-output field based on a character string of the field information, let alone specifying a control name of the input-output field based on the character string of a field information of the output field in the vicinity of the input-output field.

For at least the reasons that, as stated above, Yoshikawa is apparently directed only to converting a CUI screen display into a GUI screen display, and thus it has a different object than that of the defined invention (to determine the control name of an input-output field on a GUI field), Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention but instead is, if anything, closer to the prior art methods of assigning a name.

Applicants thus respectfully submit that Yoshikawa does not make the features of claims 1, 9, or 10 obvious.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 9, and 10, as well as claims 5-6 and 8 (dependent on claim 1) and claim 11 (dependent on claim 10), are allowable over the references of record, including Yoshikawa. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner should call Applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Arik B. Ranson
Registration No. 43,874

May 27, 2003

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315
Customer No.: 24978

K:\1503\63657\Amend B.doc